

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 10, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Reverend William Feickert, St. James Lutheran Church and St. Peter Lutheran Church, Tuscarawas, OH, offered the following prayer:

Shalom, shalaam, pax and peace.

Almighty God, source of true wisdom and peace: We invoke Your blessings upon the U.S. House of Representatives assembled to deliberate upon those things which would make for the maintenance, well-being and extension of justice in our land and around the world; and as You have promised to send Your Spirit to lead people into truth, so rule the hearts and guide the counsels of the representatives of our country, that protected from the errors of human weakness, they may seek only the well-being, justice, strength, and peace which comes from caring for Your people and creation. Bless and guide the people, the President, Vice President, the Speaker of the House, legislators, magistrates, executives, service men and women and chaplains.

Bless America with peace, strength, justice, and tranquility. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REV. WILLIAM F. FEICKERT

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, the House has been honored today with the opening prayer by Rev. William F. Feickert, pastor of St. James Lutheran Church in Tuscarawas and St. Peter Lutheran Church in New Philadelphia, both in Ohio. And a friend of mine.

Reverend Feickert is joined here today by his lovely wife, Dorothy, his family, and members of his congregations, and other friends.

Throughout his distinguished service in Tuscarawas County, Reverend Feickert has contributed immensely to the betterment of his community. The special dedication and spiritual devotion that Reverend Feickert brings to the major tasks which confront him everyday goes beyond the norm. His experience of over two decades in service to our Heavenly Father has been

especially rewarding—to the Reverend as well as his family and friends. But, most of all, those who come to him during their times of need have come to realize the greatest reward of all.

I would also like to add Reverend Feickert's spiritual commitment and outstanding service to America's veterans. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to have Reverend Feickert as our guest chaplain today. May we always recall the inspiration that he has given us on this special day.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3244, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 99-259) on the resolution (H. Res. 261) waiving certain points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 3244) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY CONCERNING AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HAMILTON, from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-260, part I) on the resolution (H. Res. 226) directing the Secretary of Defense to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives relating to American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, which was ordered to be printed.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD BUY AMERICAN

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday while President Reagan was announcing economic sanctions against South Africa, the Democrats were frolicking at the Speaker's Golf Tournament. The golfers were given a terry-cloth souvenir hat which says on the outside "Speaker's Tournament" and the ini-

tials "Democratic National Committee," but on the inside the label says "Made in the Republic of South Africa."

Mr. Speaker, it will not do much good for Republicans to condemn apartheid if the Democrats are going to keep boosting South Africa's economy. With our textile industry in such trouble, I hope next time the Democrats will buy American.

MANDATORY MEDICARE/SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. REID asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, part of the American dream for each of us has been the knowledge that we will have the resources to take care of ourselves throughout our lives.

A good example of how this has been accomplished is in my own State of Nevada, where State and local employees have contributed to a retirement system that will provide such security during the postretirement years.

Because of the overwhelming success of this system, I am strongly opposed to any congressional attempts to make Social Security and Medicare coverage for State and local employees, including teachers, mandatory.

Such a requirement would be inequitable, especially where a State's retirement system already meets the needs of the people.

I am, of course, referring to possible revenue-generating legislation now being considered by Congress to reduce the deficit, at the expense of Government workers nationwide, those workers who already are contributing their fair share to solvent retirement systems.

We're all concerned about solutions to balance the Federal budget, but I oppose action that loads such horrendous financial burdens on States like Nevada that have done an outstanding job of maintaining their own financial integrity.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE REPORT

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is apparently no business pending before

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the House today. We should be taking up the Defense authorization conference report. Some Members on your side are attempting to stall the bill in order to take a few more pot shots at it.

There will be a dangerous precedent set if a separate vote is demanded on this issue.

Do you think it's going to stop there seriously? Do you think the other body won't start playing little tricks like this every time the majority doesn't get its way in conference?

If we are going to open this up to a separate vote, why stop there? Why not do the same thing on the budget process?

Why not take separate votes on all issues about which certain Members feel strongly?

This could be the first crack in the dam. It could eventually lead to a deluge of separate votes.

Is this what we want to see? I think not.

We debated the Defense authorization bill. We voted. It was all fair and square. If we change the game rules here then they will surely be changed for other conference reports, here and in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I submit it is a bad precedent and we ought not to take that route.

ONE MORE YEAR OF BUSINESS AS USUAL ON HAZARDOUS WASTE CONTROL?

(Mr. ECKART of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKART of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this year the 30th of September means much more than just the end of another fiscal year. It may also mean the end for one of the Nation's foremost environmental protection programs, the Superfund Program for cleaning up our Nation's hazardous wastes.

H.R. 2817, the \$10 billion bipartisan bill that Congressman LENT and I introduced earlier this summer, and which has already cleared the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, would do much to alleviate the problems that the beleaguered program has experienced, but there are those who would use the September 30 deadline to offer a simple 1-year extension of the program. Nothing could be more dangerous or more hazardous to America's health than 1 year more as business as usual, 1 year more of delays, loss of funds, regulatory laxities, lack of schedules, new incentives and development for permanent clean-up technologies, lack of delay of cleaning up Federal facilities, and the continued problems with leaking underground storage tanks.

Mr. Speaker, we need our \$10 billion, 5-year reauthorization. Playing short-

term politics with the health of millions of Americans is not in the Nation's interest.

□ 1210

A PROPOSED TOTAL 15-PERCENT CUT IN AMTRAK FUNDING

(Mr. COATS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, just before we left for our August recess, we adopted the conference report on the budget by a pretty substantial bipartisan vote. Some people said that this was just a hollow promise, that it is a sham, and that when the actual appropriations come up, we will not even adhere to that.

We have two chances in the next few days to prove our cynics wrong, and I hope we do. Despite the fact that the budget conference report calls for a 15-percent reduction in the Amtrak funding level, both the Amtrak authorization bill and the Department of Transportation appropriations bill provide only a 10-percent cut in Amtrak funding.

It is clear, through our hearings and discussions and debate over this matter in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that Amtrak can survive as an efficient and effective national railroad system with an extra 5-percent cut, and I intend to offer an amendment or amendments to both of those bills before us to bring this level to 15 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this effort to demonstrate that all those things we said about the budget are not just hollow promises. What little credibility we have left with the American people will be lost if we cannot find an additional 5-percent funding cut for Amtrak.

OPPOSING USE OF TAX-DEDUCTIBLE FUNDS FOR PROVIDING MILITARY AID TO CONTRAS

(Mr. LUKEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to give warning to my colleagues as to American taxpayer subsidies to the Contra military forces in Nicaragua. Some private citizens in this country are making war in Central America, and doing it with tax-deductible funds.

One of these groups, the U.S. Council for World Freedom, in gaining tax exemption from the IRS, promised not to provide "materiel or funds to any revolutionary or counterrevolutionary group," and yet sent helicopters and riverboats to the Contras. The council's director, Maj. Gen. John K. Singlaub, admits to using his international

contacts to channel lethal aid to the Contras. Another group, the Nicaraguan Refugee Fund, held a fundraising dinner, which netted over \$200,000. Of this sum, only \$3,000 went to aid refugees, while over \$115,000 went for "consulting fees."

We have voted several times against providing military aid to the Contras, and yet several private organizations have been funneling supplies to the Contras, despite their promises to the IRS not to do so.

Twenty-six of our colleagues and I recently wrote to the Commissioner of the IRS, Roscoe Egger, suggesting that the IRS review the tax status of these organizations.

I urge your support of this much needed review. These organizations are not to aid the Contras militarily. They should not circumvent the law.

DEFICIT WATCH

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, none of us in this Chamber should wonder why we have \$200 billion budget deficits, year after year. Some call the budget uncontrollable. It's no such thing. We in the Congress just refuse to control it.

Let me offer a perfect example. Chemical weapons. Immediately after the House passed its \$56 billion deficit-reduction package last spring, we voted on chemical weapons. Here we were, faced with an up-or-down vote on a weapons system we don't really need—a weapons system whose purchase could easily be deferred—a weapons system whose ultimate price tag could reach \$20 billion.

How did the Congress vote? To spend the money. Three-quarters of the freshman Members voted that way, and they made the difference. I'll bet many had campaigned as fiscal conservatives, promising to cut the deficit once they came to Washington. But, when the chips were down, they voted to spend.

The House will have a second chance to vote on chemical weapons soon. I'll be interested in seeing what happens this time. So will the American people.

SOUTH AFRICAN SANCTIONS

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on the question of South Africa, we must ask how much is enough. Yesterday, the President took some steps in the right direction by imposing sanctions against the apartheid government of Pretoria. But considering the magni-

tude of injustice in South Africa, the administration's action is too tentative and too grudging—it is simply not enough.

Policy as important as our South Africa policy cannot be conducted on the level of rhetoric and symbolism. It must have the force of law—which is why I supported the sanctions bill that we passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. Unlike the administration's action, this bill gives hope to the forces of moderation and nonviolence in South Africa—at the same time it eliminates our Nation's complicity with the abhorrent system of apartheid.

Americans are a proud people because we believe that our Nation stands for right over wrong. We know that racism is wrong. We know that apartheid is wrong. And we know that constructive engagement with a government that practices racism and apartheid is wrong. Let us not soft pedal our Nation's policy. Let us send a united message to the world and to the people of South Africa that the American people stand for what's right—that we stand for justice and an end to apartheid.

INVOKING A TEMPORARY IMPORT SURCHARGE TO ADDRESS TRADE IMBALANCE PROBLEMS

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, although we returned to work last week, the thoughts and comments of our constituents are still fresh in our minds. During my travels through the 23d District of Pennsylvania, I talked with a lot of folks who had one question on their minds—what are we in Congress going to do about the trade deficit, and more importantly the resultant loss of jobs?

It is increasingly apparent that Congress may take some severe measures if the administration fails to devise a proposal which deals with our trade difficulties. I am also in favor of taking prompt action, as long as it is responsible and reasonable in its approach, and does not contribute to the initiation of a trade war with our partners. Still, our American companies and workers need relief, and the time has come to act.

Last month, I wrote to the President asking him to invoke section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974. This would allow him to impose an import surcharge of up to 15 percent, in the form of duties, on articles imported into the United States. It would not last longer than 150 days without congressional approval and could be targeted to specific countries and imported articles.

Mr. Speaker, with our annual trade deficit approaching \$160 million, it is clear that Congress and/or the administration will do something, and soon, in the area of trade. Of course, a temporary and minimal import surcharge would not, by itself, solve all our trade problems. But it could be an intermediate step to show our determination to address our problems, while not committing us to long-term approaches that gamble our future economic well-being.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC., August 2, 1985.

HON. RONALD REAGAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you to ask that you consider responding to our persistent trade difficulties with Japan by invoking Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974.

As you know, Section 122 provides you with temporary authority to impose an import surcharge of up to 15% ad valorem, in the form of duties, on articles imported into the United States. This authority, not to exceed 150 days without Congressional approval, can be invoked "to deal with large and serious U.S. balance-of-payments deficits", and can be targeted to specific countries and to specific imported articles.

As you are aware, with our 1985 trade deficit expected to reach a record \$160 billion, protectionist sentiments in Congress and around the nation have grown to incredible proportions. These have particularly focused upon Japan, which is likely to have a 1985 merchandise surplus of almost \$50 billion with the U.S. This imbalance has affected and will continue to affect virtually every region of our country and every sector of our economy.

Let me point out, Mr. President, that clear precedent exists for the use of an import surcharge. As noted in the Senate Finance Committee report accompanying the 1974 Trade Act: "the use of surcharges for balance-of-payments purposes has gained de facto acceptance in GATT. Major industrialized countries which have resorted to surcharges include France in 1955, Canada in 1962, the United Kingdom in 1968, and Denmark and the United States in 1971."

It is my belief, Mr. President, that invoking Section 122, targeted specifically against Japan, would effectively emphasize our concerns regarding the bilateral trade relationship. At this time of enormous federal budget deficits and an overvalued dollar, it would also add much needed revenue to the Treasury, decrease U.S. demand for Japanese goods by readjusting the undervalued yen, improve the balance of U.S. exports to Japanese imports, and give the U.S. additional leverage in encouraging Japan to allow U.S. exports greater access to Japanese markets, thereby preserving and creating American jobs.

Moreover, Section 122 can specifically target Japan, minimizing the potential for friction with GATT members. In addition, Section 122 allows the exclusion of those imports that meet the special needs of the U.S. economy, can be rapidly instituted or rescinded by Executive Order, and would be limited to only 150 days unless extended by a specific act of Congress.

I would also argue that the use of Section 122 authority as a trade policy option is vastly superior to the numerous proposals currently before Congress. The Gephardt-

Bentsen-Rostenkowski 25% import surcharge proposal (H.R. 3035, S. 1449), to take one example, is far less flexible than Section 122. It would remain in force until 1991, it could not be targeted to specific countries, it does not allow the exclusion of certain imports, and its surcharge level is probably too high for price increases to be readily absorbed by the exporting nations.

Mr. President, I share your belief in a free market system, and appreciate your efforts to balance the many elements of our trade and economic policies. But free trade can not be a unilateral U.S. policy. Japan does not practice free trade, and until our trade difficulties are resolved we need to adopt policies that encourage a speedy and equitable resolution of these difficulties. Section 122 authority will help us accomplish this goal, and I strongly urge you to invoke its provisions.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

THE UNITED STATES
TRADE REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, DC., August 23, 1985.

HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, Jr.,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BILL: I have been asked to reply to your letter of August 1 to the President concerning the problem of the U.S. trade deficit and the potential use of Section 122 of the 1979 Trade Act to impose a temporary surcharge on imports.

I think that we are in agreement that we have several major problems on the trade front. One of the primary problems is the very large federal budget deficit which the President and many in Congress wish to see reduced substantially. As you note, we also have experienced a strong dollar, which impedes our exports and encourages U.S. imports. This has resulted from the inflow of foreign capital to partially finance our federal deficit and economic growth. Further, we have had poor growth in our major export markets, with a severe debt crisis in many developing countries which has cut our exports. Finally, and very importantly, in some major markets, such as Japan, we face barriers to our exports of goods and services and distortions to flows of direct investment.

Our trade deficit reflects the cumulative effect of these problems. But is a temporary surcharge the answer? Wouldn't a surcharge detract from the attention needed to continue our efforts to reduce federal spending and deficits? At the end of the "temporary" period of the surcharge, wouldn't we be back where we are now?

Japan accounts for less than a third of our world trade deficit. Therefore, to substantively reduce the trade deficit, we would have to impose a surcharge much more generally than only on Japanese products. However, most of our trade partners would retaliate against our exports, since they do not believe that they should pay the price of our excessive budget expenditures and a strong dollar.

To make the maximum contribution to reducing our trade deficit, we have to work hard to reduce our federal expenditures in order to bring them more in line with our revenues. We also have to vigorously pursue our national trade interests. Instead of a broad or selective surcharge, I believe that, should our trade partners not play the game fairly, we must employ specific actions to gain leverage to achieve more open markets.

I hope that you will continue to work on the trade issue. It is one of the most important national economic issues that we have to address. I also hope that you will continue to express your thoughts and recommendations to the President and me.

Sincerely,

CLAYTON YEUTTER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 1985.

HON. CLAYTON YEUTTER,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Thank you for your response to my recent letter to the President regarding Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974. I appreciated your comments and agree with much of what you said.

In particular, I agree that the budget deficit is an important factor in our trade problem. I was hopeful that we would do more on this, and was disappointed that we chose a policy that delays the tough decisions until next year.

Yet, having said this, I must also say that I don't think that the solution to our trade deficit can wait until we solve our budget problem. Several countries, most notably Japan, have domestic policies which in some way discriminate toward our exports. These need to be dealt with, regardless of any action we take on the budget. Moreover, I'm not convinced that a lower budget deficit and a resulting lower dollar can occur soon enough to enable U.S. industries to rapidly recapture the foreign and domestic markets which have been lost in recent years due to both macro and microeconomic problems.

I also agree that the imposition of Section 122 is not a substitute for a long-term trade policy which is well-reasoned and part of an overall U.S. approach to economic policy. However, Section 122 would serve several purposes. First, it could serve as an alternative to many of the other trade proposals currently gaining momentum in Congress. The surcharge doesn't have to be 15%, it could be 10% or even 5%, and it doesn't have to last a full 150 days and could be targeted to specific countries and products. Second, it would send an appropriate signal to those countries, particularly Japan, that believe we will continue to maintain the unacceptable status quo in our trade policy (I know you agree we need a trade policy that goes beyond mere "nagging"). Third, it would give the Administration and Congress more time to prepare a comprehensive trade policy to deal with our trading partners in the future. Fourth, it could provide short-term relief to those industries and individuals feeling the pinch from the surge in imports.

Like yourself, I do believe that we should work to avoid a trade war. In my opinion, it would certainly be disastrous for all concerned. However, it is also my belief that we can best avoid retaliation by our trading partners by looking at measures which are short-term in nature and less severe than those such as a 25% long-term import surcharge.

I agree that a temporary surcharge is not the entire answer to this very complex problem; however, until our trading partners realize that the United States will not continue to allow the kind of unfair trading practices that have contributed to our \$150 billion 1985 trade deficit, I believe that stronger steps are necessary.

I would be happy to meet with you at the appropriate time to discuss this matter in

greater detail. Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINGER,
Member of Congress.

THE HOUSE WEDNESDAY GROUP,
Washington, DC, September 4, 1985.
Letters to the Editor
New York Times,
New York, New York 10036

DEAR SIR: The Times has correctly identified the need to offer an "alternative to workers displaced by imports" ("Pay \$68,000, Save a Shoemaker"—August 27), rather than answering the call for protectionism ringing through the halls of Congress.

One way to address this problem would be for Congress to pass a retraining proposal recently introduced by Representatives Bill Clinger (R-PA) and Nancy Johnson (R-CT)—The National Training Incentives Act of 1985, H.R. 1219. This legislation, backed by cosponsors ranging from conservative Republicans to members of the Black Caucus, has several significant provisions which would help to retool U.S. workers.

First, it would provide a 25% tax credit for training expenses in excess of a 5-year historical average, thereby rewarding the type of retraining, on-the-job training, which labor and business agree is the most effective. Structured like the R&D tax credit, this provision will only be used if business decides it needs to spend more on retraining and will generate \$4 in private-sector financed retraining for every dollar lost in federal revenues.

This approach is particularly important when considering the bias which now exists in the tax code between incentives for R&D and plant and equipment and for worker retraining. For example, in FY 1986, tax incentives for R&D and plant and equipment totaled \$79.2 billion, while incentives for worker retraining came to a paltry \$25 million. This represents a ratio of over 300 to 1. This is even more appalling when you consider that in recent years the contribution of education and training to total productivity growth is about one-half.

Another component of the Clinger-Johnson proposal would permit workers to finance retraining with money withdrawn, without penalty or taxation, from their IRAs or annuity accounts. This would allow roughly 13 million working class households to take advantage of an already established network of retirement financing.

Although some might argue that the IRA was designed exclusively with retirement in mind, it is interesting to note that a similar retirement vehicle, the 401(k) Deferred Compensation Plans, does not have the inflexibility of the IRA, but instead allows for early withdrawal for a variety of purposes, including but not limited to the payment of college tuition, purchasing a home, or even the coverage of unreimbursed medical costs, depending upon the particular plan.

A third provision of this important legislation removes a significant disincentive to retraining by allowing any displaced worker who is otherwise eligible for unemployment compensation to collect unemployment assistance while participating in a training program. Unfortunately, at present only 13 states allow a worker in a retraining program to receive unemployment compensation. This must change. We do not need a system which mandates that people wait until their unemployment has run out before they can develop a new skill.

Our nation needs to pursue a more vigorous employment policy so that America's workforce will not lag behind with outmoded skills while technology moves forward. While others advocate the use of protectionist measures to keep jobs in this country, we believe an alternative such as H.R. 1219 is a positive and far-sighted proposal which comes to grips with changes in the world economy. As the Times correctly observes, "policymakers who want growth must do more than nobly pledge allegiance to free trade." The Clinger-Johnson proposal is just such an effort.

Sincerely,

STEVEN HOFMAN,
Executive Director,
DAVID HEBERT,
Research Associate.

PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER ON SOUTH AFRICA FALLS SHORT OF CONGRESSIONAL GOALS

(Mr. WOLPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, by continuing to resist the congressional sanctions legislation and by offering his own far weaker version of sanctions in his Executive order, President Reagan continues to fail to take advantage of an opportunity he now has to both embrace and strengthen the extraordinary bipartisan consensus that exists, within this Congress and across this land of ours that we must make a very direct break with the policies of constructive engagement.

In South Africa itself, the President's Executive order will be understood essentially as a means of trying to resist stronger sanctions. It thereby encourages the Afrikaners, the white minority regime, in their belief that they can in fact hold on indefinitely, that the current American interest in South Africa is only a passing fancy, and that they can maintain their horrendous system of apartheid without real economic cost and without any significant degree of international isolation. The President's executive order is temporizing. His constant remarks by way of an apology for South Africa are only encouraging greater repression, inviting greater violence, and terribly compromising American interests not only in South Africa but throughout the African Continent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to abide by the consensus that exists in this Congress to give his support to the congressional sanctions legislation.

SUPERFUND REAUTHORIZATION—WE MUST ACT NOW

(Mr. LENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, on September 30, 1985, Superfund, the most important environmental law enacted in this decade, is scheduled to expire. We must not allow this to happen. Congress must act immediately to reauthorize and strengthen this vital program governing the cleanup of our Nation's hazardous waste sites.

Superfund is a complex law, involving serious and controversial issues. Some would avoid confronting these issues by enacting a simple 1-year extension of the legislation. That kind of nonaction would have disastrous consequences for the Superfund Program and for the environmental health of this Nation.

The Environmental Protection Agency has planned to spend \$900 million for the cleanup effort in fiscal year 1986. A 1-year extension at current funding levels would slash that obligation by fully two-thirds, to \$300 million. EPA would be forced to slam on the brakes, stopping a critical program which is finally gaining momentum. I have a list of 67 hazardous waste sites at which EPA has already slowed or delayed cleanup pending the extension and expansion of this program. I am submitting the list of sites for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to enact a comprehensive reauthorization of Superfund, we will have failed the citizens who look to us to protect their health. I urge my colleagues to join me in working for immediate House action on a comprehensive Superfund reauthorization bill.

SITES AT WHICH WORK HAS BEEN HALTED DUE TO UNCERTAINTY OF SUPERFUND REAUTHORIZATION

Site name	Stage ¹
EPA Region I:	
Charles-George Reclamation Trust Landfill, Tyngsborough, MA	RD
Groveland, Groveland, MA	RD
Hocoma Pond, Westborough, MA	RD
Nyanza Chemical Waste Dump, Ashland, MA	RD
Nyanza Chemical Waste Dump, Ashland, MA	RD
Beacon Heights Landfill, Beacon Falls, CT	RD
McKin Co., Gray, ME	RD
Picillo Farm, Coventry, RI	RD
EPA Region II:	
Bog Creek Farm, Howell Township, NJ	RD
Bridgeport Rental & Oil Services, Bridgeport, NJ	IRM
Bridgeport Rental & Oil Services, Bridgeport, NJ	RD
Burnt Fly Bog, Marlboro Township, NJ	RD
D'Imperio Property, Hamilton Township, NJ	RD
Gems Landfill, Gloucester Township, NJ	RD
Gems Landfill, Gloucester Township, NJ	IRM
Glen Ridge Radium Site, Glen Ridge, NJ	RD
Goose Farm, Plumstead Township, NJ	RD
Helen Kramer Landfill, Mantua Township, NJ	RD
Lipari Landfill, Pitman, NJ	RD
Montclair/West Orange Radium Site, Montclair/West Orange, NJ	RD
Swope Oil & Chemical Co., Pennsauken, NJ	RD
Marathon Battery Corp., Cold Springs, NY	RD
Olean Well Fields, Olean, NY	RD
Sinclair Refinery, Wellsville, NY	RD
Sinclair Refinery, Wellsville, NY	IRM
Wide Beach Development, Brant, NY	RD
York Oil Co., Moira, NY	RD
EPA Region III:	
Douglasville Disposal, Douglasville, PA	RD
Drake Chemical, Luck Haven, PA	RD
Lackawanna Refuse, Old Forge Borough, PA	RD
Lansdowne Radiation Site, Lansdowne, PA	RD
Moyers Landfill, Eagleview, PA	RD
Tyson's Dump, Upper Merion, PA	RD
Sand, Gravel & Stone, Elkton, MD	RD
EPA Region IV:	
Davie Landfill, Davie, FL	RD

SITES AT WHICH WORK HAS BEEN HALTED DUE TO UNCERTAINTY OF SUPERFUND REAUTHORIZATION—Continued

Site name	Stage ¹
EPA Region V:	
Miami Drum Services, Miami, FL	RD
Acme Solvent, Morristown, IL	RD
Byron Salvage Yard, Byron, IL	RD
Outboard Marine Corp., Waukegan, IL	RD
Wauconda Sand & Gravel, Wauconda, IL	RD
Charlevoix Municipal Well, Charlevoix, MI	RD
Charlevoix Municipal Well, Charlevoix, MI	RD
Northern Plating, Cadillac, MI	RD
Verona Well Field, Battle Creek, MI	RD
Verona Well Field, Battle Creek, MI	RD
Eau Claire Municipal Well Field, Eau Claire, WI	IRM
Schmalz Dump, Harrison, WI	RD
Arcanum Iron & Metal, Darke County, OH	RD
New Lyme Landfill, New Lyme, OH	RD
Old Mill, Rock Creek, OH	RD
Old Mill, Rock Creek, OH	RD
Lehliier/Mankato Site, Lehliier/Mankato, MN	RD
EPA Region VI:	
Bayou Bonfua, Slidell, LA	RD
Bayou Bonfua, Slidell, LA	RD
Old Inger Oil Refinery, Darrow, LA	RD
Bio-Ecology Systems, Inc., Grand Prairie, TX	RD
EPA Region VII:	
Ellisville Site, Ellisville, MO	RD
Aides Corp., Council Bluffs, IA	RD
EPA Region VIII:	
Woodbury Chemical Co., Commerce City, CO	RD
EPA Region IX:	
Celtor Chemical Works, Hoopa, CA	RD
Celtor Chemical Works, Hoopa, CA	RD
Del Norte County Pesticide, Crescent City, CA	RD
San Gabriel Valley, La Puente, CA	IRM
EPA Region X:	
Commencement Bay, Well 12A, Tacoma, WA	RD
Western Processing Co., Inc., Kent, WA	RD
Western Processing Co., Inc., Kent, WA	IRM
United Chrome Products, Inc., Corvallis, OR	RD

¹ Stage refers to the phase of remedial action. RD = detailed design stage or development of plans and specifications; RA = remedial action or the actual implementation of the selected cleanup option; IRM = Initial Remedial Measure or implementation of a small cleanup action prior to final remedy.

THE "YUGO"—A PRODUCT OF SLAVE LABOR

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, when President Reagan lifted the voluntary auto import restrictions last March, he opened the floodgates for foreign cars entering our shores. Now, there is yet another new entry in the race to capture our American market. It is called the Yugo. It is built in Yugoslavia. Ringing in at \$3,990, it is being purchased sight unseen in many parts of the country. The low price sounds magnificent, but let's consider why. The workplace in Communist Yugoslavia is a far cry from what it is here in America. How can our workers possibly compete with Yugoslavian workers who have no rights and work for 60 cents an hour? Slave labor. And because Yugoslavia is a Communist country, its companies can afford to build this car at a loss just to steal more of our domestic market. A very clever subversion of our economic system, isn't it.

There is no question that there is room for improvement in the American auto industry. It must modernize, improve quality, and expand productivity. But what this trade issue really comes down to is fairness and a decent standard of living for families across

America. The flow of foreign goods on our markets, like the Yugo, may look good to some shortsighted consumers. But when imports rob jobs, America suffers. Our standard of living is second to none. It depends on workers working and plants producing. Our Nation's trade policy must reflect this reality. As President Lincoln said, if this country ever falls, it will fall not from without, but from within.

PAY RAISES FOR GPO EMPLOYEES

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, while holding town meetings in my district in Utah during the August recess, I learned that the problem of greatest concern to my constituents is still the ever growing Federal deficit. We here in Congress debate that issue regularly. Yet, despite our talk about reducing the deficit and cutting the budget, many situations exist which are defeating our efforts.

As a founding member of the Grace Commission caucus, I have been concerned for some time now that so much of taxpayers' money is going to support unnecessary Federal spending each year. One classic case is the Government Printing Office which employs 2,300 Federal employees. These workers have long been among the highest paid in their profession, in or out of Government. In fact, some are being paid up to almost \$18,000 a year more than people with similar jobs in the Government.

Yet, the Joint Committee of Printing recently granted permission for the GPO to receive generous 15 percent cost-of-living pay hikes over the next 3 years for all GPO craft workers. If we continue to allow this kind of unnecessary generosity, we will never gain control over Government spending and our ever-increasing Federal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article by Donald Lambro with my remarks in the RECORD to further explain this example of wasteful spending:

[From Human Events, July 20, 1985]

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE PAY RAISES SOAK TAXPAYERS

(By Donald Lambro)

REAGAN APPOINTEE IGNORES BUDGET DEFICITS

Let's say you're the head of a large corporate subsidiary and your parent company's running a \$200-billion annual deficit. The interest payments alone on your debts are costing you \$130 billion a year. The board of directors has voted to slash spending next year by \$56 billion to bring the firm's fiscal crisis under control, but it remains deeply split about where to cut.

Meanwhile, your workers are demanding a pay raise (these workers don't care if the

company's plunging into debt) and you've got to decide whether your company can afford to give it to them. What do you do?

That's the real-life situation that faced Ralph E. Kennickell Jr., head of the \$600-million Government Printing Office, whose 2,300 printers, bookbinders and production workers have long been among the highest paid in their profession, in or out of the government.

Congress' investigating arm, the General Accounting Office, discovered in 1983 that GPO workers were being paid from \$3,222 to \$17,879 more than workers performing similar jobs elsewhere in the government.

Yet Kennickell's incredible decision was to offer GPO's craft workers a generous cost-of-living raise of up to 15 percent during the next three years and to cut their workweek from 40 hours to 37-and-a-half hours.

In making the wage-hike offer, Kennickell was thumbing his nose at the Administration's efforts to cut the budget as well as the budget-cutting mood in Congress. Faced with another record-shattering \$200-billion-plus deficit next year, both the House and Senate budget bills called for freezing federal pay where it is.

However, Kennickell, seemingly oblivious to all this, volunteered the pay hike without any real effort to engage in tough negotiations with his printers. "He just handed it to them on a silver platter," said one well-placed GPO official.

But before the wage hike could take effect, it had to be approved by GPO's lord and master, Congress' Joint Committee on Printing—which, in the past, has been notoriously generous to the printer unions that represent GPO's craft workers. Notably, the chairman of the committee is Maryland Sen. Charles Mathias. Many GPO employees live in his state, and their unions have enthusiastically supported his reelection campaigns.

Thus, despite a budgetary crisis of historic proportions, when the Joint Committee on Printing met on June 13, it merrily voted, by 6 to 2, to ratify Kennickell's costly giveaway to GPO's printers—leaving taxpayers to foot the bill.

The big spenders who irresponsibly agreed to the pay raise were Senators Mathias, Mark Hatfield (R.-Ore.) and Wendell Ford (D.-Ky.); plus Representatives Joseph Gaydos (D.-Pa.), Ed Jones (D.-Tenn.) and Frank Annunzio (D.-Ill.).

Only two lawmakers on the committee opposed the pay raise: Representatives Robert E. Badham (R.-Calif.) and Pat Roberts (R.-Kan.).

Under the wage package that the committee rubber-stamped, GPO craft workers will receive a whopping 4.6 percent pay raise this year and up to a 5 percent raise—depending upon the cost-of-living index—in each of the succeeding two years.

"These lucrative benefits," Rep. Roberts told me, "fly in the face of every taxpayer willing to sacrifice in an effort to reduce the deficit."

Why would Kennickell—whose patron is Georgia's Mack Mattingly, one of the Senate's staunchest foes of excessive federal spending—push for this pay raise? Many believed that by supporting the raise for GPO workers, he hoped to improve his weakened chances in the Senate Rules Committee, which has been stubbornly sitting on his embattled nomination since last year.

At this writing, the Rules Committee panel, also chaired by Mathias, was expected to vote soon on Kennickell's nomination. That nomination had been snared in a con-

trovery over Kennickell's financial-disclosure form, in which he reported earning about \$20,000 more in 1981 than he actually did earn. He attributed the error to "carelessness."

However, whichever way that vote turns out, Kennickell and Congress' Joint Committee on Printing already have done irreparable damage to the efforts to halt the spending spiral at GPO.

The fact that Kennickell, a Reagan appointee from Georgia, could make such an offer reveals why some of the President's most conservative allies in Congress have been suspicious of Kennickell ever since the White House picked him to succeed GPO Public Printer Danford Sawyer last year.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROTECTION ACT OF 1985

(Mr. HUGHES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on the Judiciary, by a unanimous voice vote, favorably reported the bill, H.R. 3132, the Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act of 1985.

One of the major new dangers that our Nation's police officers face on patrol or in investigation, is that the criminals are arming themselves with "cop-killer bullets," ammunition specially designed to penetrate their protective armor.

This bill reflects more than 3 years of work on this problem by the Subcommittee on Crime and the Administration. The result is a balanced, workable bill that will provide law enforcement officers with protection from armor piercing ammunition. I want to commend our distinguished colleague from New York, MARIO BIAGGI, for his tireless efforts in helping us to overcome the obstacles that this bill has faced.

The ammunition covered is carefully and narrowly defined, and has no sporting purpose. The bill would prohibit the manufacture and importation of this ammunition except for limited purposes.

The only issue about which there is any disagreement is controlling the sale of this ammunition. The administration's experts concede that it is quite possible that several million rounds of this ammunition could be available on gun dealers' shelves. It is this ammunition that now poses the greatest danger to our Nation's police officers. This bill prevents its sale to the general public by licensed dealers.

This bill will give our Nation's police officers an urgently needed margin of safety. Passage of this legislation must be our highest priority. We must not be blinded by the smokescreen of the National Rifle Association which says that this measure takes away from the Nation's sportsmen.

This ammunition cannot be controlled if it is primarily intended to be used for a sporting purpose. Nothing is taken away from sportsmen.

I urge the House to support prompt passage of this bill to protect the Nation's law enforcement officers.

□ 1225

AMERICAN BUSINESS WOMEN'S DAY

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which requests the President to designate September 22, 1986, as "American Business Women's Day."

This day would mark the importance of American business women to the whole Nation. This day is supported by the American Business Women's Association which actively promotes professional and educational advancement for women. ABWA has more than 110,000 members and 2,100 chapters.

This organization awards scholarships to women not only entering college, university, or vocational training programs, but also to women who need to refresh job skills before reentering the work force and to women who need certain courses in order to qualify for promotion and career advancement. Since 1949, ABWA has awarded more than \$18 million in scholarships. Just last year, ABWA awarded \$2.9 million to over 5,700 women.

The ABWA deserves a hearty congratulation for their work in behalf of an important group, the American business woman.

Mr. Sanders, I invite you and our colleagues to join me in celebrating American Business Women's Day on September 22, 1986.

PRESIDENT MISSES OPPORTUNITY FOR PEACEFUL SOLUTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has missed a tremendous opportunity to assist moderate whites and black leaders such as Bishop Desmond Tutu in moving toward a peaceful end to apartheid in South Africa.

The President has derailed the bipartisan legislation containing economic sanctions against the government in Pretoria, which passed the House by a vote of 380 to 48, and in an earlier version, the Senate, by a vote of 80 to 12.

The President's Executive order invoking sanctions against South Africa

should be seen for what it is: an invidious political tactic. The sanctions moving through Congress were a sincere effort to alleviate the suffering of millions of black South Africans under the yoke of apartheid. It is disturbing in the extreme for the President to reduce this effort to a mere political maneuver designed: First, to head off a confrontation with Congress; and second, as the New York Times put it, "above all to protect South Africa from significant harm."

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States and the people of South Africa both deserve better.

A FEW THINGS THAT HAPPENED WHILE CONGRESS WAS OUT OF TOWN: SEVEN AMERICANS REMAIN HOSTAGES IN LEBANON

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, a few things happened while Congress was out of town concerning the seven Americans held hostage in Lebanon.

I had the privilege of meeting with President Assad of Syria, Vice President Khaddam and Foreign Minister Shara in Damascus in mid-August on behalf of my constituent Father Lawrence Jenco and the six other Americans held hostage in Lebanon, as well as the 4 Frenchmen. I was most graciously received by President Assad and his Government. Our talks were frank and open. I sincerely hope that these efforts may encourage a renewed search to locate and effect the release of the American and French hostages.

NBC reported Sunday that the wives of two Frenchmen kidnaped in Beirut have received letters from their husbands.

A Kuwaiti Embassy employee kidnaped in Beirut on July 11 was released unharmed at midnight August 12, after 33 days of captivity.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 246th day of captivity for Father Lawrence Jenco, a Servite priest from Joliet, IL, and a personal friend.

William Buckley, a U.S. Foreign Service officer has been held hostage 543 days today.

Today marks the 490th day of captivity for Rev. Benjamin Weir, a Presbyterian minister.

Terry Anderson, the Associated Press bureau chief in Beirut, was kidnaped 178 days ago.

Today is the 105th day of captivity for David Jacobsen, the director of the American University Hospital, Beirut.

Thomas Sutherland, dean of the agriculture school at the American University, has been held for 92 days.

Today also marks the 280th day since the disappearance of Peter Kil-

burn, the American University librarian.

Mr. Speaker, the hostage crisis in Lebanon continues.

EXECUTIVE ORDER ON APARTHEID NOT ENOUGH

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat encouraging that the White House has finally rethought its policy toward South Africa and the President by Executive order is attempting to preempt any action in the other body on a conference report that has been over there for some time where we have overwhelming bipartisan support for the imposition of sanctions representing our distaste and our abhorrence with apartheid and the repressive actions of the Government in South Africa. But issuing the Executive order, unfortunately, is not going to solve anything, in my judgment. The preemption might work for a while in the other body, but the issue is not going to go away because the Executive order does not do away with the issue.

So what we have, unfortunately, appears to be a confrontation between the President and the Congress where the Congress overwhelmingly wants to do something and it will be so interpreted in South Africa. What we need to have, of course, is a challenge to that government and a change of the U.S. policy. The best way to do that would be statutorily where you have strong bipartisan support and you show to the world that the executive branch and the legislative branch are joined together in making a statement with respect to our opposition on what is going on in South Africa. The way it looks now is it appears to be that we are divided, that something else has happened. I think that is unfortunate.

What should really happen is the other body should take that conference report, send it to the President and the President should sign it and let it become law. Then everybody would know exactly where the United States stands.

ABOLISH THE SYNTHETIC FUELS CORPORATION

(Mr. WORTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a burst of can-do spirit, Congress launched the Synthetic Fuels Corporation in 1980 with a \$15 billion appropriation and a mandate to go forth and create fuel from oil shale. It didn't matter that the technology was not

readily at hand, \$15 billion could get it there as needed.

Just in case the outright \$15 billion was not enough, Congress said, let there be price supports and loan guarantees. After all, they don't cost anything. Synfuels, it was decreed, would lead the way to enhanced national security and energy independence.

Five years later we are no closer to a commercial synfuels industry. The Synthetic Fuels Corporation has wasted money by the barrel, given new meaning to the word mismanagement and has served as a glaring example of Government waste, fraud, and abuse. If anything, the money wasted on the Synthetic Fuels Corporation has hurt our national security and made us take giant steps backward from more self-sufficiency in energy production.

The House of Representatives has done the correct thing in deleting funds for the Synthetic Fuels Corporation in the Interior appropriations bill.

May our brother legislators across the Capitol bring us closer to debt independence by excising the \$6 billion for synfuels in their Interior appropriations bill. And may our enthusiasm for fiscal responsibility be put to good use by passing legislation to terminate the present synfuels program. Amen.

TRADE ANNOUNCEMENT ON BRAZIL

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if President Reagan's recent announcement here in Washington was supposed to reassure America that we have the resolve to develop a firm and fair trade policy, it did not.

Among the nations which the President targeted for attention in our foreign policy as to trade last Saturday was the nation of Brazil and the President specified that Brazil's resistance to American exports of computer products would be taken on head on.

There was an announcement, though, several weeks ago which received less fanfare and attention relative to Brazil. That announcement was made here in Washington by our Treasury Department and it will have a more far-reaching effect on the economy of the United States than the announcement by the President that we are going after Brazil's imports of American computers.

On August 27 our Department of the Treasury announced that they would allow the Brazilians to export ethanol to the United States duty free until November 2.

At a time when American workers in Decatur, IL, and across the Nation are

battered with imports, we will allow up to 500 million gallons of blended Brazilian ethanol to come in duty free.

At a time of a Federal deficit, by not collecting the duty, we will walk away from \$300 million that our Treasury could be amassing.

At a time of depressed agricultural prices, this decision by the Treasury will drop the price of corn 15 cents a bushel.

At a time of farm foreclosures across our Nation, American farmers will lose \$1.2 billion in farm income because of this Treasury decision.

As we have incurred the largest trade deficit in the history of the United States, we need only look to decisions like these for the cause.

Is it any wonder in light of this Treasury decision that Congress here in Washington and the American people are demanding a trade policy that makes sense and stops this crippling export of our Nation's jobs and wealth.

BEST WISHES TO THE HONORABLE TOM BEVILL

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, when we returned last week from our August work recess, a familiar face, good friend and distinguished colleague was noticeably missing from our ranks. Fortunately, Congressman TOM BEVILL is only temporarily absent, and I am happy to report that he is doing well, recovering in his Jasper, AL, home from heart bypass surgery a few weeks ago.

Over the years, Alabamians have been wise in their selection of public servants to represent us and our country. Statesmen like the late Speaker William Bankhead, his father John, and Senators Jim Allen, Lister Hill, and Justice Hugo Black have all received their rightful degree of respect during their tenure here in this House and in the other Chamber as well.

Today, the Alabama delegation is honored to have TOM BEVILL as one of our most distinguished Members. Webster's Dictionary defines a statesman as "one who exercises political leadership wisely and without narrow partisanship." An abbreviated definition of a true statesman would simply be "TOM BEVILL."

TOM, we all wish you a speedy recovery. Get well soon, we need you here in Washington.

TIME RUNNING OUT FOR CONGRESS TO ACT ON TRADE PROBLEMS

(Mr. BONKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, time is running out for Congress to act responsibly on the trade problems that beset this country. We can no longer ignore the trade deficit, the unfair policies that give other nations a competitive edge, the emerging threat this agreement represents to our domestic industries.

This administration has no trade policy; indeed President Reagan just recently recognized there was even a problem.

But time is running out on our Government to correct this ominous trend. And patience is running out in Congress.

Yet there is a right way and a wrong way to deal with this problem. Reorganizing the executive branch to better cope with trade matters is a step in the right direction.

Today I am introducing a bill to establish a new Department of Commerce and Trade. This department would consolidate most of the trade functions now delegated to the Trade Representative and the Secretary of Commerce. The new Secretary would be the principal spokesman for the administration on trade and would be the President's top trade negotiator. The Department would administer our import relief and export control laws and would administer our export promotion programs.

Responsible trade reorganization can strengthen the formulation and implementation of U.S. trade policies, improve coordination among the agencies, and increase the weight given to our trade negotiators, and enhance our competitive position in world markets.

NATIONAL DAY OF FASTING TO RAISE FUNDS TO COMBAT HUNGER

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, this week I will be introducing a resolution declaring the Sunday prior to Thanksgiving, November 24, 1985, as the "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger." This is not a commemorative piece of legislation, but a bipartisan effort to raise money to feed the hungry in the United States and around the world.

The resolution encourages the people of the United States to forfeit one or more meals (if they can) on that day, Sunday, and contribute the money saved from those meals to a hunger relief organization. The quality that makes this resolution outstanding is that: First, it costs those who choose to participate nothing more than what they would have

spent on food for their own meals; second, it gives the American people an opportunity to share potentially tens-of-millions of dollars in aid with victims of hunger; and third, it costs the Government absolutely nothing.

What better way is there to celebrate the blessings in our lives, but to generously share with those less fortunate? Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me as original sponsors in support of this most special event.

MORE BAD NEWS FROM THE FARM

(Mr. McCURDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, if we truly want to keep American families on the land, Congress must address the farm credit crisis now.

Recent disclosures that the Farm Credit System, may need a Federal Government bailout to survive, is just the latest in a series of developments that have staggered the farm community. First quarter reports on the farm economy showed us that farm income had dropped more than 30 percent from 1 year ago when we said farm income equaled the 1930's. Bankers polled recently in the Southwest reported more than half of their farm loan repayments were lower than 1 year ago. Farm prices are substantially lower than last year. Small business closings in rural communities are higher than last year. Bank failures have reached alarming numbers. Many American farm communities are taking on the appearance of ghost towns. We're losing an American way of life.

Today, a newspaper in my State reports that the farm economy has become so depressed in parts of Oklahoma that suicide counselors say there is a definite increase in cases within the agriculture community.

Mr. Speaker, the farm bill will not solve these problems. The farm community is bearing the brunt of U.S. fiscal irresponsibility: Huge deficits in the Federal budget and in trade. This administration and this Congress must unite to bring about substantial deficit reduction and a balance in trade. We must take responsibility for the economic crisis in agriculture and work to resolve it.

□ 1240

COMMENDING DOT FOR DECISION ON TRANSPORTING HAZARDOUS WASTE

(Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to commend the Department of Transportation for issuing a very significant and much awaited decision yesterday.

That decision goes to the heart of this Nation's ability to effectively route hazardous materials over our highways to underground storage sites.

The ruling I refer to denies a bid by New York City to avoid shipments of nuclear wastes from Brookhaven Laboratory on Long Island from traveling on highways which traverse the metropolitan area. As an alternative, the city proposed to barge the waste to my State and send it on a much longer, circuitous route.

While I obviously am interested in protecting my State's interest, I also rise to commend the decision for its far broader implications. The national standards of transporting dangerous materials and the fact that these standards must be supreme over attempts by certain localities is all of our responsibility.

A contrary decision would have opened the floodgates for hundreds—perhaps thousands of similar appeals, and the result would be chaos as far as the integrity of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act is concerned.

Again I commend DOT's decision.

HOUSE AND SENATE SHOULD CONTINUE ACTION ON ANTI-APARTHEID LEGISLATION

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge our colleagues in the other body to continue to act on the House-Senate conference report on H.R. 1460. Yesterday the President recognized that the policy of "constructive engagement" is ineffective on addressing the worsening repression of South Africa's policy of apartheid. The President's Executive order does not go far enough, however, and action by the Congress should continue.

The best hope for change in South Africa now lies in the conference report before the Senate. H.R. 1460 offers important incentives for action by threatening more severe sanctions within 1 year if no significant progress is achieved toward the elimination of apartheid. The President's Executive order does not provide future sanctions and, therefore, is more likely to be viewed by the South African Government as a set of inconveniences to be tolerated rather than incentives for change.

I believe it is imperative for us in Congress to continue our action to establish a workable plan to resolve this ongoing violation of basic human dig-

nity and individual freedom by adopting the conference report on H.R. 1460.

PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER ON SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. EDGAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues who have preceded me in condemning the President's proposal on South Africa.

I think the President's proposal is hollow and shallow and circumvents the bipartisan congressional consensus that has developed over the last several months that strong action has to be taken against the Government of South Africa on the issue of apartheid.

I share with my colleagues the comment that was made by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [BILL GRAY], who indicated that the President's Executive order on South Africa contains the rhetoric of our legislation, but not the teeth necessary to send a firm signal to South Africa and to the world. I agree with that statement.

It is time for the House and the other body to have a real constructive engagement with the White House on this issue of South Africa and demand strong action and strong sanctions against that Government, and stronger penalties in the future if, in fact, no action is taken. I would urge the other body and this body to place on the President's desk that congressional consensus, bipartisan effort and make sure that the President has to stand up and speak out much stronger and much more firmly on this important issue.

PRESIDENT'S ACTION AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. CROCKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House conference committee on the antiapartheid bill, I want to commend the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee and the chairman of our Judiciary Committee for the excellent statements they made here this morning setting forth their views with respect to the President's recent action.

President Reagan's wrist-slapping order against the apartheid government of South Africa does little to encourage meaningful change in apartheid. Indeed, the President's action not only waters down each of the immediate sanctions proposed by the Congress; but it also eliminates the key proposal that would automatically

trigger further and stronger sanctions in a year if acceptable steps to end apartheid were not taken.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must clarify and strengthen the President's message to Pretoria by enacting into law the complete House-Senate conference report. The basic message to South Africa must be, that it is imperative now that the Pretoria government begin meaningful negotiations with black South African leaders, including the imprisoned Nelson Mandela and the Africa National Congress and the imprisoned Rev. Allan Boesak and the United Democratic Front.

U.S. WORKERS COMPETING IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in a recent article published by the U.S. News & World Report, September 2, 1985, edition, this prestigious weekly news magazine features the question of whether or not U.S. workers can compete in international trade.

On page 40, I will refer to its comparison in the study of U.S. productivity versus Japan. I quote: "Despite Japan's gain, an average American worker can still outproduce his counterpart in Japan. Overall hourly output of a U.S. worker exceeds that of a Japanese one by about 20 percent. Most studies," it goes on to say, "give Americans the edge in efficiency, in agriculture, finance, wholesale and retail trade and in business services. Japan is rapidly gaining on the U.S. in productivity."

Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have fallen behind in America is because in the last several years, the United States has had no trade policy. That is, we have taken no action to represent American workers and farmers in dealing in international commerce. As a result, the sales of U.S. products have declined severely and the trade deficit has risen dramatically.

A few minutes ago, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER] announced the introduction of a reorganization bill that would reorganize our Government in the form of a Department of Trade. I rise today to support that bill and to say it is a first step toward developing a U.S. trade policy to deal with the current crisis.

THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION'S FIRST ANNUAL FOOD FESTIVAL

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, the American Heart Association will be sponsoring its first annual food festival during the week of September 8 to 14 to spotlight the value of good nutrition and dietary control of cholesterol and saturated fat to reduce the risk of heart disease.

The American Heart Association will join with more than 6,000 supermarkets throughout the United States by providing information on "heart-healthy" eating, including the importance of reading nutrition labels on packaged foods, as well as how to choose lean cuts of meat and preferable dairy products.

Heart and blood vessel disease kill more men, women, and children in this country than any other cause of death. The economic costs of cardiovascular disease will amount to an estimated \$72.1 billion in 1985 alone. Most cardiovascular diseases are the result of atherosclerosis, a condition in which the lipid (fat) and cholesterol levels in the blood are higher than the body requires to maintain good health. When the body accumulates an abundance of fat and cholesterol, the excess can collect in the walls of the arteries, forming deposits called plaque. If the accumulation of plaque is allowed to progress over the years, an artery can become completely clogged with fats, cholesterol, and other debris. If the artery supplies the heart, the result can be heart attack; if it supplies the brain, the result can be a stroke.

Medical scientists tell us that lowering the level of cholesterol and saturated fats in the diet can reduce one of the risks of coronary disease. The American Heart Association has advocated since 1961 a diet low in saturated fat and cholesterol for everyone—healthy individuals and those with heart and blood vessel disease. According to the American Heart Association, by limiting cholesterol consumption to less than 300 milligrams per day and fat intake to less than 30 percent of daily calories, individuals can reduce the risk of heart attack and stroke.

Please join with me in commending the American Heart Association and participating retailers for promoting this first annual national community nutrition event. This is an excellent example of the cooperation that can exist between the voluntary and private sector to accomplish a worthy health promotion goal.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2600

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOAKLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1985, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 3128, DEFICIT REDUCTION AMENDMENTS OF 1985

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight on Wednesday, September 11, to file a report on H.R. 3128, Deficit Reduction Amendments of 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ORDER ON SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat disturbed today as I have listened to some of those who have criticized the President's initiative on South Africa, and particularly somewhat disturbed by the tone of the remarks I have heard, because as one who has been fairly deeply involved in trying to bring about a change in policy in South Africa, it has seemed to me that what we set out to do was to get the administration to change their policy toward a more activist kind of policy.

With the President's announcement of yesterday, that has certainly been done. Now it is true that what the President ended up doing is not exacting what I would have done, but it does apply open and direct pressure to the South African Government which was something that we said all the way along was what we wanted to accomplish. So if it is not precisely what some of the rest of us would have done, if it is not precisely what was in the conference report that a lot of us voted for, if it is not precisely what we outlined in various bills that we vote and put into the hopper on South Africa, the fact is that it is a major and historic step in the right direction, and ought to be looked at in that vein.

The most important thing with it, in my mind, is that it is a policy that the administration now assumes ownership for. If we would go the route of passing the conference report, sending that down to the White House, having it vetoed and overriding that veto on Capitol Hill, it might make us feel good about the fact that we have forced the President to adopt a policy that he did not want. But the fact is that the administration, having criticized and vetoed such a bill, would have no ownership for that policy.

□ 1255

I have usually found that people do not take very much initiative on things that they are not particularly involved with themselves, where they do not have any ownership involvement for themselves. So what you would end up with is an administration grudgingly applying a policy that has been mandated on it about South Africa by the Congress.

Now, it seems to me that that would not get us to where we want to be. I think that we worked, a lot of us, toward trying to achieve a kind of bipartisan agreement and consensus on a policy that would bring change to South Africa. It seems to me that it is distinctly unhelpful to have some here in the Congress who seem to want a confrontation with the President more than they want a change in South African policy. I think our objective should be achieving reform in South Africa, not fighting among ourselves about the nuances of the policy options that we choose. Let me also say in the same context that I found Bishop Tutu's statement yesterday distinctly unhelpful toward uniting the American people in the cause of obtaining real human rights progress in South Africa.

The American people know that President Reagan is not a crypto-racist, as Bishop Tutu called him. That is an ill-advised and totally inaccurate characterization by Bishop Tutu and should be retracted with an apology. Such an apology would help, I think, get the American people together and united toward doing the kinds of things that are necessary in order to bring about changes in the apartheid system in South Africa. All of us who want change in South Africa have a duty to put politics and personal pride of authorship about policies behind the need to formalize a policy that has broad-based support for ending apartheid in South Africa. That is what we should be all about, broad-based support for a policy that has a chance of changing some things in South Africa. The President took a historic step in that direction, and, rather than looking for ways to nitpick that policy change by the President, we sought to be looking for ways to build upon that initiative as a unified American approach to human rights progress in South Africa.

There is enough confrontation in South Africa; we do not need unnecessary confrontation here on our policy toward South Africa.

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I am somewhat out of breath. I apologize because I was in another part of Capitol Hill when the gentleman took the special order. I want to

compliment the gentleman for taking this special order.

Did the gentleman hear anyone in the well this morning talking about Ethiopia?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct. We have got human rights problems around the world beyond South Africa. It seems to me what the President has done in taking the step he did is, he helped define that this nation is going to take strong stands, and I would hope that we will begin to hear more about situations like Ethiopia.

I would be glad to yield further.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The reason that I raise this question about Ethiopia is very important. As the gentleman realizes, when the foreign aid legislation was up, we added an amendment to that bill that required the President to report back to the House in 30 days on whether there is a deliberate policy by the Government of Ethiopia to actually starve some of the people in the rebellious areas in Ethiopia. I find it quite interesting to read what the administration had to say about that situation. I commend the report to everyone in this body and submit the entire text in the RECORD. Although some 7 to 8 million people are in imminent danger of starving to death and many thousands upon thousands have already died because of the cruel and deliberate policies of the Mengistu dictatorship, the President has not imposed sanctions against the Government of Ethiopia. In Ethiopia it is not a question of civil rights, it's a question of life or death. But I hear no one in this body speaking out on that issue.

Certainly if we are going to speak out on South Africa, and we should as we are all opposed to apartheid, we should speak out equally—if not more forcefully—against the death policies in Ethiopia.

At this point, I submit the text of the Presidential determination.

PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION No. 85-20
Memorandum for the Secretary of State.
Subject: Determination with Respect to Ethiopia.

Pursuant to Section 812(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (P.L. 99-83), I hereby determine on the basis of current evidence that the Ethiopian Government does not meet the condition specified in subsection (c)(1) of that section.

This determination, together with the justification therefor, shall be reported to the Congress immediately. This determination shall be published in the Federal Register.

JUSTIFICATION

Section 812(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (P.L. 99-83) provides as follows:

Prohibition on Imports and Exports.

(1) The President shall determine, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, whether the Ethiopian regime is conducting a deliberate policy of starvation of

its people and has not granted fundamental human rights to its citizens. The President shall submit that determination and the basis for that determination to the Congress.

(2) If the President determines that such a policy is being conducted and that such rights are not being granted, paragraph (3) shall take effect if the Congress enacts a joint resolution approving that determination.

(3) If the conditions specified in paragraph (1) and (2) are met:

(a) goods and services of Ethiopian origin may not be imported into the United States; and

(b) except for emergency relief, rehabilitation, and recovery assistance, goods and services of United States origin may not be exported (directly or indirectly) to Ethiopia.

In order for the prohibition on imports and exports to enter into force, the President must first determine that both elements of the condition are met, and so report to the Congress, and Congress must then enact a joint resolution approving the determination.

For the reasons described below, the Ethiopian Government does not meet the condition described in subsection (c)(1). The Ethiopian Government's respect for human rights is deplorable, and its political, economic and military policies have no doubt caused vast and unnecessary human suffering, including starvation. However, as explained in greater detail below, the available evidence does not justify a determination that the Government of Ethiopia is at this time "conducting a deliberate policy of starvation."

1. Human Rights.—The Ethiopian Government's record on human rights is deplorable. In addition to other human rights concerns, the 1985 implementation of the policy of "resettlement" of famine victims, especially from the northern regions, is cause for deep concern. Many of almost half a million persons have been forcibly separated from their families and rounded up, from their villages and at relief camps and feeding sites, and confined under armed guard at transit camps. Transport south by air, bus or truck was accomplished under crowded and inhumane conditions to resettlement sites in primitive wilderness areas, totally lacking in basic health, sanitation and other essential services. Those resettled were compelled to perform long hours of hard labor clearing and cultivating land while receiving only minimal shelter and rations. Veterans of the resettlement campaign who have escaped report beatings, murder, imprisonment, deprivation and what they consider enslavement in a highly regimented work environment where mortality rates are exceedingly high. The inhumane resettlement program diverts from the food relief effort badly needed transport and logistical support and supplies. We and others have repeatedly brought to the attention of the PMGSE our objection to this policy.

Additional details on the Ethiopian Government's human rights practices can be found in the section on Ethiopia in the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1984, which concludes that human rights prospects for the future remain bleak. A copy of the summary paragraphs from that report is attached.

2. Starvation.—The Ethiopian Government's political, economic, and military policies have no doubt caused vast and unnecessary human suffering, including starvation.

The determination called for by Congress, however, requires a finding that the regime is currently and deliberately following a "policy of starvation." The available evidence does not justify a determination that the Government of Ethiopia is, at this time, conducting a deliberate policy of starvation.

In recent months the Ethiopian Government has, in response to pressure from the U.S. and other donors, taken certain actions to facilitate an enhanced relief effort. For example, (1) the Ethiopian Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC) has agreed to a small program to expand feeding in the north where fighting has severely disrupted relief activities; (2) the Ethiopian Government has reduced the pace of its resettlement program, which has diverted substantial transportation resources that could have been used to alleviate starvation; (3) recent evacuations of relief camps have apparently been more humane, and the people involved adequately provided with food and seed. Many problems need continuing effort, however, including the need for much expanded feeding in contested areas, and end to coercive resettlement, highest priority to transporting relief goods, and greater freedom to monitor relief programs. We will continue to review these aspects, and to press the Government of Ethiopia to make further sustained improvements.

Section 812(c) does not call for any determination concerning the past conduct and policies of the Ethiopian Government concerning starvation of its people. Nor does it call for an evaluation of policies that may have had political or military purposes, but which nevertheless caused increased starvation. That Government's past conduct, and the effects of its policies, are matters of grave concern, even though the evidence on these subjects cannot justify a determination under the statute. Background material concerning Ethiopia's past practices is therefore appended to this justification.

ATTACHMENT 1.—EXCERPTS FROM 1984 REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES IN ETHIOPIA

"Ultimate power in Ethiopia, wielded by Chairman Mengistu Halle-Mariam and a small group of former military associates, continues to be exercised and maintained through intimidation and arbitrary arrest. The country is without civil or political freedoms and without institutions or laws to protect its citizens' human rights. The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia maintains complete control over the media, labor, education, internal and external movements of Ethiopian citizens, and all political processes.

"Persons expressing opposition to the regime or who are believed not to support it are routinely arrested by security police and subjected to torture in varying degrees; some executions have been reported as well. The individual citizen enjoys no legal protection and may be detained at any time, without explanation and be held indefinitely without any prospect of trial. For example, as many as 1,000 low and mid-level Ethiopian Government officials and business or government-affiliated organization members were arrested in Addis Ababa during June, July, and August.

"Ethiopia, with a population of over 40 million, continues to have one of the lowest per capita incomes in the world (\$140). The vast majority of Ethiopians live with inadequate housing, water, sanitation, and medical facilities. The Government has so far

been unwilling to reduce its sizable military spending to increase relief or development efforts. More than one million Ethiopians remained outside the country, the result of years of war, drought, poverty, civil strife, and oppression. Human rights prospects for the future remain bleak."

ATTACHMENT 2.—BACKGROUND ON ETHIOPIAN PRACTICES FAMINE

The present regime in Ethiopia, the Marxist government of Haile Mariam Mengistu, came to power during the chaotic and violent period of the Ethiopian revolution of 1974-76. Since then the regime has consolidated its position by ruthless often violent suppression of opponents. It has been dependent upon the Soviet Union and Cuba for military and political support. The ideological orientation of the leadership is antithetical to the United States and, since Chairman Mengistu's assumption of power, relations between the U.S. and Ethiopia have been severely strained. The property of U.S. nationals was expropriated, diplomatic representation was reduced to lower levels and security and economic assistance halted.

Drought is no stranger to Ethiopia. Periodic drought and famine have laid waste to that nation from time immemorial. The current cycle of drought struck first in 1973 and 1974. Northern areas, already eroded and overworked, were then as now hard hit. Close on the heels of that catastrophe came the revolution which by 1976 had completely eliminated the feudal agrarian system of hundreds of years. The revolutionary government carried out an extensive land reform but assigned low priority to the creation of other viable national agrarian policies, as it focused energies on maintaining political predominance and on the war with Somalia and the internal armed conflict in Eritrea and Tigray. Particularly detrimental to agricultural production and to the rights of the rural population have been the official policy in favor of collectivization and the preponderant allocation of agricultural development resources to inefficient state farms and collectives. Small independent farmers, the backbone of rural population, have suffered. Following years of poor rains, drought came again even more viciously than before into this fragile landscape in 1983 and 1984. The land had never really recovered from the drought of the mid-seventies and, due to the revolution and the internal armed conflict, the rural social system was in shambles. Incorrect government policies, inattention, and a refusal to accept the evidence at hand combined to create the tragedy which now confronts us. The combination of these policies with nature's capriciousness have led to the starvation of hundreds of thousands of people with millions more still at risk.

FAILURE OF THE ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT TO AMELIORATE FAMINE CONDITIONS

With the failure of the 1983 rains it became clear that Ethiopia again faced a famine of potentially massive proportions. Food stocks which would normally carry through one year of bad rains were seriously depleted by years of insufficient rains. Warnings from knowledgeable Ethiopians as well as international food production/weather monitoring agencies were ignored. No effective famine planning was done by the Mengistu government, although the Relief and Rehabilitation Commission (RRC), established in 1974, was still in existence. The port of Assab was in fact closed

from November 1983 to April 1984 to allow only cement and military equipment to enter. When the rains failed again in 1984, the situation became critical but despite the pitiful scenes of suffering and deprivation due to drought, the Mengistu regime refused to take steps to ameliorate the problem. Donors could not get from the Ethiopian Government answers to basic questions affecting food needs. Rather than alleviate suffering, the regime continued to assign high priority to military spending financed by the Soviet Union.

The expensive preparations for the ostentatious September 1984 ceremonies celebrating the tenth anniversary of the socialist revolution were further evidence that the government put politics ahead of feeding hungry people. Given the specter of starvation, such celebration constituted a callous misallocation of resources. The incongruity was apparent to many. International pressures and criticisms of Ethiopia mounted, forcing the Mengistu regime to reconsider, in a defensive fashion, its responsibilities towards its citizens. From that point, November 1984, onward, the Government of Ethiopia grudgingly began to coordinate with donor governments to permit famine relief operations. The sheer enormity of the logistical task has been overwhelming. The process has been plagued with misunderstandings, broken promises, misrepresentations and a continued refusal by the Ethiopians to give relief efforts top priority over security and political considerations. The internal armed conflict also created problems, as both sides of the struggles in Eritrea and Tigray interfered with food shipments.

Following is a summary of Ethiopian Government actions that have resulted in acute human suffering, hunger and even starvation and have been the basis for some arguing that the Ethiopian Government had a deliberate policy of starvation.

The Ethiopian Government was unwilling to allocate available vehicles to the famine relief effort, but used them for military, resettlement and commercial purposes.

The Ethiopian Government was unwilling and later did not facilitate the movement of food to non-government controlled areas of Eritrea and Tigray. International relief workers earlier witnessed strafing and bombing of civilians fleeing to the Sudan. The bombing of villages, the burning of crops and the theft of farm animals have in the past been attributed to forces of the PMGSE.

In what was described as an effort to get people who were dependent on feeding centers back to the land, the Ethiopian Government forcibly evacuated tens of thousands from Inbet, a relief camp in Gondar Province. Most of these evacuees were driven out without adequate provisions and some died. Pressure from the U.S., the UN and other donors, plus international press attention, led to Chairman Mengistu reopening the camp. The Ethiopian Government claimed the precipitous evacuation was ordered by local forces. However, two months later, military forces again tried to forcibly empty Inbet. This time, UN intervention stopped the evacuation. The Ethiopian Government has told the U.S. and other donors that it intends to close all the camps so that people can return to their land to plant. The U.S., UN and other donors are carefully monitoring these actions so that people will be adequately provided with food and seeds for planting.

The Ethiopian Government, at the depth of the crisis, continued to implement a

policy of forced resettlement. This policy included the allocation of substantial transportation resources, including trucks, which would have alleviated starvation. By this allocation of resources the PMGSE demonstrated that its priority was not alleviation of starvation.

We have received persistent reports that food supplies, most provided by the World Food Program, were diverted to local militias and army units; while, we have no evidence that these diversions have involved other than relatively small amounts of food, the persistence of these reports continues to be of concern.

The Ethiopians seized a shipment of Australian wheat intended to be delivered to Tigray and Eritrea via Port Sudan. The Ethiopian Government justified its actions by charges that outside forces were delivering aid to rebels fighting the Ethiopian Government.

Inappropriate PMGSE pricing policies and collectivized agriculture and state farms (particularly in resettlement areas) are having significant negative impact on food production, especially basic food grains. The imposition of a system of collectivized agriculture and state farms (through highly objectionable, coercive means) has proven to be inefficient and unproductive and is contributing further to hunger and starvation. In addition, the PMGSE policy of imposing artificially low official market prices on the sale of basic foodstuffs and forcing farmers to sell at these prices has naturally resulted in a significant decline in production, which has exacerbated further the current food shortage situation. Both the U.S. Government and IBRD have urged the PMGSE to correct its inappropriate agriculture policies. To date no reforms have been made. Given Ethiopia's high rate of population growth, this lack of action augurs ill for the future when the country will have even more people to feed.

EVIDENCE OF RECENT ETHIOPIAN GOVERNMENT ACTION

Recent evidence does not at this time justify a determination that the Ethiopian Government is now conducting a deliberate policy of starvation. Despite the difficulties mentioned above, the international community provided unprecedented aid to Ethiopia. In FYs 1984 and 1985, the Western community has provided 1.1 million metric tons of food, plus millions of dollars for transport. The U.S. is the largest donor, committed to meeting one-third of the need. About 50 percent of the food actually delivered, however, has come from the United States. Both the U.S. and UN, as well as other donors' insistence on certain conditions being met have led to improvement in the situation. This insistence, steadily applied over the past 18 months, has produced sporadic action on the part of the Ethiopian government on logistics, a greater role for humanitarian private voluntary organizations, and better distribution of relief supplies. Some examples of these improvements are the following:

After months of wrangling, the RRC has now agreed to a program to expand feeding throughout the north, the area of civil strife, where fighting has severely disrupted and prevented relief activities. This plan, which is being implemented by American private voluntary organizations and International Committee of the Red Cross, and is designed to increase humanitarian access to the large population at the risk in Eritrea and Tigray, began in August. To date, heavy

rains and fighting between Ethiopian and rebel forces have interfered with food distribution both from within Ethiopia and across the border from Sudan.

In recent weeks, the Ethiopian Government has substantially reduced the pace of its resettlement program, while adhering to its original policy and targets.

After a delay of many months, the Ethiopian Government granted full accreditation to the five USAID staff removing ambiguity about their status and improving their ability to manage the U.S. relief effort. Accreditation was granted to USAID personnel only after repeated unsuccessful attempts by our Embassy and then higher level intervention of the UN.

After the earlier disastrous events at Ibnet, wherein 60,000 drought victims were driven from the camp at gun point while their huts were burned and possessions destroyed, recent relief camp evacuations were witnessed by NGO, UN and U.S. officials. All report the evacuations were orderly and that people were adequately provided with food and seed. The RRC instructed the evacuees to go to relief centers nearest their homes after a month for further rations.

At our insistence, the PMGSE has recently publicly acknowledged the considerable U.S. and other western assistance, in press reports in Ethiopia and at an August 23 press conference in Washington.

These steps have gradually produced considerable progress in the overall fight against famine. Recent UN figures show improvement in food distribution. According to July 24 UN figures, the total number of beneficiaries receiving emergency food in May, 1985, was approximately 4.6 million, up from about 3.4 million in the months of March and April. Of this May total, half (2.3 million) received their food from the RRC, with an estimated 750,000 of these (or 16 percent of total recipients) being in the resettlement areas, 995,000 in the north (Eritrea, Tigray, and Wollo) and the rest in other areas. Of the 2.3 million beneficiaries who received food from non government organizations (NGOs), 1.7 million (or three fourths) were in Eritrea, Tigray, and Wollo; the remaining 600,000 were in Gondar, Shoa, Harrarhge and Sidamo; and none were in resettlement areas. In terms of metric tons, in May the RRC and NGOs each distributed 35,000 metric tons of food, up from 25,000 and 27,000 respectively in April and 28,000 and 21,000 respectively in March.

The latest World Food Program figures also show an improvement in food distribution in Ethiopia. They report that food distribution steadily increased from 49,000 tons in March to 78,000 tons in July, with more than half distributed by NGOs and the rest by the RRC. Population being reached also increased from 3.4 million in March, to about 5 million by the end of June, representing 63 percent of the estimated total at risk. A recent joint survey by the office of the UN Assistant Secretary General in Addis Ababa and the International Committee of the Red Cross showed that 80 percent of the population in need in Tigray is being reached. For Eritrea, the percentage is about 76 percent.

While progress has been made recently in resolving some of the problems associated with the famine relief effort, many problems need continuing effort. These include expanded feeding in contested areas, an end to forced and coercive resettlement, highest priority to transporting relief goods, reduced port fees, and freedom to monitor

relief programs. Given the failure of the Government of Ethiopia to meet its commitments in the past, we will continue to monitor these with the greatest care.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will allow me to reclaim my time, it is my contention that the President took us down that road yesterday. The President has defined some ways of putting pressure on the South African Government to bring about some change. It is my contention that, rather than being excoriated here in the House because we do not like minor portions of what the President did, that what we ought to be doing is finding ways of accommodating that toward a policy that addresses the future.

TENTATIVE AGREEMENT ON DRILLING OFF THE CALIFORNIA COASTLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a few moments talking about the unfortunate breakdown in the agreement that had been achieved between the Secretary of the Interior, on the one hand, and a bipartisan group of Representatives from the California congressional delegation, on the other hand, with regard to the issue of Outer Continental Shelf oil drilling or offshore oil drilling.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the August recess, for 6 very intense weeks of discussions and negotiations, a bipartisan group of Members of both the House and the other body, including both of U.S. Senators, met for some 20 hours with the Secretary of the Interior to attempt to, and to in fact, succeed in achieving an agreement between the Secretary of the Interior, on the one hand, and this bipartisan group of California Representatives, on the other hand, to try to come up with a long-term resolution of these complex and difficult issues of drilling off the California coastline. This was an agreement that was hailed by the Secretary of the Interior, himself, in a joint press conference with a number of us on the delegation as a landmark agreement.

The Secretary came to California and spent some 10 days in hearings up and down the State of California and during the first several days of those hearings again reiterated the importance and significance of this balanced agreement under which a significant part of the California coastline would be protected to the year 2000 and under which some 150 tracts would potentially be available for oil and gas exploration along the California coastline.

There were a number of coastal cities that were deeply concerned

about this compromise, a number of tracts along the coastline of California in sensitive coastal areas, but people understood that a compromise needed to be reached, a balance needed to be struck.

There was give on both sides, there was a significant compromise by both sides, and it was the hope of those of us who have been involved in this process that we would come back to Washington and ratify this agreement.

Unfortunately, at a meeting that took place this morning called by the Secretary of the Interior and at which he invited all 45 Members of the California congressional delegation, the Secretary essentially announced that he was no longer able to accept this agreement, that he wanted substantial changes in it. He was unable to tell us today what those changes would be, despite the fact that we have been involved in this process for such a long time and despite the fact that all of the issues, I think, are well known to both sides.

The Secretary indicated that new information had come to his attention. But after a, I think, fairly thorough discussion of the issue, I think it was clear to Members on both sides of the aisle who were at this meeting that the so-called information was neither new nor was, in fact, information. This was simply a lobbying campaign by the oil industry on this administration, which has been so sympathetic to that industry, to urge this administration to go back and get as much as they could possibly get in terms of tracts off the most sensitive parts of the California coastline to satisfy what has unfortunately become an insatiable appetite, a voracious appetite, from this industry.

Mr. Speaker, under prior administrations, whether they were Democratic or Republican administrations, under the administration of President Nixon, under the administration of President Ford, and under the administration of President Carter, those most sensitive areas along the California coastline have been out of bounds for coastal drilling in the immediate future because it was understood by bipartisan administrations and by bipartisan Representatives in this House and in the other body that we were dealing with some of the most precious natural resources in this Nation's inventory and that, in the absence of an absolute energy emergency, a real energy emergency, those resources need not be drilled at this time.

Unfortunately, this administration has broken with that bipartisan tradition initially under the auspices of Secretary Watt who essentially wanted to open up every inch of the California coastline to offshore oil drilling; we had hoped and we had believed that the current Secretary of

the Interior was involved in a good faith effort to resolve this issue for a long period of time so we would not have to continue to come back to the floor of this House or the other body to resolve this issue in a legislative fashion. An agreement was reached, an historic agreement, in the words of the Secretary a landmark agreement, and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, today the Secretary announced to the delegation that he could not live with that agreement.

Unfortunately, we will have to come back to this body seeking the legislative protection that we hoped could be achieved through a resolution of this issue, through a compromise. That will not be possible, but I do believe that it is important that the membership understand that a vast majority of our delegation on a bipartisan basis continues to want to live up to this agreement.

I think it is a sad day for a balanced energy policy and for the California coastline that this resolution has broken down.

UPDATE ON TENTATIVE AGREEMENT ON DRILLING OFF THE CALIFORNIA COASTLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the Speaker for permitting me to address the House on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, attended the meeting that my colleague, Mr. LEVINE, attended with Secretary Hodel, and when I listen to these versions I am almost amused because sometimes I get the impression that some of our colleagues are attempting to tell the American people that the issue is whether or not we shall drill off of the coast of California for the first time, that it is a pristine, virgin area untouched by oil drilling. The truth is that we have been drilling off the coast of California for the last 25 years. That is, the Outer Continental Shelf.

We have 16 platforms in Federal OCS territory containing some 800 wells that are in production right now. We have 15 platforms in State tidelands areas that contain over 3,500 wells.

We have been drilling off the coast of California in the State tideland area; that is, the area within 3 miles of shore, since 1890, the last 90 years.

The issue is not, shall we begin for the first time? The issue is: Shall we expand what has proved to be a compatible activity, given the environmental concerns that we all have?

I am a native Californian. I love the State. I believe every foot of our beach, our coastline, is environmentally sensitive. When I hear some of my

colleagues saying there are certain areas of their coastline that are more environmentally sensitive than the other areas, I sometimes think I hear the sound of elitism by those comments. The reason I make this observation is because millions of people in southern California have been using the beaches of southern California all during the quarter century of the time that we have been developing and utilizing the oil resources in the Outer Continental Shelf.

I can say to my colleagues, when you go down to the beach in southern California and play in the waves, the surf, or what have you, when you come out of the surf, you do not have oil on the bottom of your feet except perhaps in a minor area around Santa Barbara, where it comes, not from industry, Mr. Speaker, but it comes from natural seeps that have been in there from time immemorial. The Spanish explorers talked about that in their logs when they explored the California coast.

That is just part of the natural terrain of the area.

The agreement that the Secretary developed tentatively was fatally flawed from the outset. It is unrealistic. I sympathize with my colleague from Santa Monica, Mr. LEVINE. He has a real problem on his hands.

Expecting a Member from the California delegation to agree on drilling off of his or her coastline is kind of like expecting a Member of Congress to agree on the method of his own execution.

There are 17 Members in the California delegation of 45 who have coastal districts in their areas. I sympathize with those Members. They have a difficult problem because there will always be a small handful of vocal folks in those districts who will stand and say much with the concept of "[millions for defense and not one cent for tribute]" that is to say, they will never agree to any drilling off their district under any circumstances. We will never satisfy those people.

So I believe it is more rational for the delegation from California to participate along with all of us, the 435 who comprise this body, in deciding national policy for expansion of a resource off the coast of California. There are 28 of us, of the 45 who represent inland areas. I think we should have had some input into this agreement, the tentative agreement that the Secretary developed.

Unfortunately, none of us were a part of that agreement. I think that is what fatally flawed it. The tentative agreement only permits exploration of maybe 5 percent of the total resource; it exempts areas off Santa Cruz, Bodega Bay, Point Arena, that are estimated to contain in the Department of the Interior's analysis about 1 billion barrels of oil and, in the indus-

try's analysis, about 5 billion barrels of oil.

That tentative agreement locked up those three areas until the year 2000.

□ 1310

That is ridiculous. This Nation today is importing over a third of its oil every day; it is costing we Americans about \$45 billion; that is about a third of our negative trade balance. The national energy policy of America is energy independence. We pursue that policy by exploring those areas of our country off the coast that have reasonable probability of oil and natural gas.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, to having a full debate on the floor of the House where the 435 of us can decide what is going to happen to this national resource, and I look forward to participating in that debate.

SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, history teaches us that people who expect a steady improvement in their lives seldom resort to violence. People who see no future for themselves and their children often do become violent. In South Africa, a vast majority is permanently denied participation in the political and economic life of their country, based solely on their race. The tragic events we are witnessing in South Africa are the culmination of decades of frustration with the immoral and intolerable system of apartheid. The cause of peace and justice require the prompt implementation of reform. The longer that reform is postponed, the more unstable and intractable the situation will become. Our own national interests, as well as our values as a Nation, are directly involved. The President's effort to circumvent the overwhelming bipartisan consensus on compromise legislation involving South Africa is disappointing and dangerous. By abdicating leadership on this essential moral and strategic issue, the President seems content to let events take their course. We cannot afford to let that happen. It is essential that our country take decisive and meaningful action to send a firm signal to South Africa and the world that the American people expect and support prompt reform in that unhappy country. The President's program sends the wrong message.

OFFSHORE DRILLING

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 90 seconds, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman can only have 1 minute.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I will take the 1 minute, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from California intend to talk about the issue of offshore drilling?

Mr. LEVINE of California. If the gentleman will yield, yes, this gentleman does intend to.

I would like, if I could, to simply put into context a couple of the comments that the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] made so that the record is clear.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my reservation provided my colleague from California will also include in his request 1 additional minute for this Member from southern California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to address the House for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], as always, is very persuasive with regard to his side of the issue. I do think that a couple of points should be included in the RECORD so that comments perhaps will not be misunderstood.

While the gentleman is correct that only 17 of the Members of the delegation do represent coastal districts, and 28 represent inland districts, I think it should also be clear that despite that breakdown of the delegation, the vast majority of the entire delegation does support the agreement that was reached.

It is my understanding that only 11 of the 45 Members have taken a position in opposition to the agreement, which would mean that a significant number of not only the coastal Representatives, but also the inland Representatives, have taken a position in support of the agreement that was reached.

Second, with regard to the issue of resource data—which is one of the subjects that has been discussed now at some length in the meeting this morning, and I am sure we will hear more about—the point that I think needs to be emphasized is that the Interior Department had available throughout all of these discussions resource data which has not changed; it was based on its resource data that this agreement was arrived at.

OFFSHORE DRILLING

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague is correct that of the 45

members of the California congressional delegation, 11 signed a letter in opposition to this tentative agreement, which means that that would be 34 who were in some posture in between. I think 27 had signed a telegram to the Secretary very recently, indicating their support of the tentative agreement.

I can understand the 17 Members from the California delegation who represent coastal districts, because they have real sensitive problems. I want everyone to understand that.

I do not quite understand why the 28 of us who are inland are so opposed—I mean, a majority of the 28 who are inland are still in opposition to the agreement. I do not quite understand their thinking, particularly those in the San Joaquin Valley of California, because the farm organizations in our State are in favor of OCS; there are many commercial interests outside of the oil industry that are in support of OCS; and I think it is part of the process of politics that those Members from the inland areas of California in opposition to OCS should have an opportunity of defending their position against establishing energy independence for America, and I look forward to participating in that debate.

PART B MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT FOR PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, of Iowa, in introducing this bill to bring the services of physician assistants under the Medicare Part B Program. The purpose of this measure is to increase access to health care for older Americans. But, I am glad to say, it will not add a penny to the Medicare Program.

Physician assistants are skilled health professionals who perform many of the same duties as physicians such as taking patient histories, conducting physical exams, and, in some States, even writing limited prescriptions. Thus, physicians are able to take care of more patients, but patients get more of their doctors' attention and they get better care.

Currently, Medicare part B covers physician assistant services when they are rendered in a certified rural health clinic or in a health maintenance organization [HMO] or similar program. This coverage policy has been a success. Now Senator GRASSLEY and I want to see these same services available to other Medicare part B beneficiaries. To deny this coverage limits access to health care for some of our senior citizens, and it runs cross-purpose against our health manpower training programs.

For example, in July, both the House and the Senate unanimously passed the health manpower amendments of 1985. Included

in this bill was a \$14 million, 3-year authorization for physician assistant training programs. It unanimously passed. But the irony, and inefficiency, is that while we are financing the training of physician assistants, we are doing less than we can to make sure older Americans can take advantage of their services.

This legislation would allow us to use these skilled health professionals. And, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the proposal is budget neutral. The bill creates a reimbursement level slightly lower than the reimbursement rate that a physician would otherwise receive. In other words, the increased access, and resultant increased Medicare cost, are offset by a lower reimbursement rate.

Increased access to health care for senior citizens without increase in cost to the Medicare Program and better use of health manpower training investments—two good reasons for Congress to take the action Senator GRASSLEY and I are proposing.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that a Congressional Budget Office letter speaking to the budgetary impact of my bill be included in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BEVILL (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for the week of September 9, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER), for September 11, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DANNEMEYER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHANDLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 15 minutes, on September 19.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LUCA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEVINE of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. OAKAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, on September 11.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, on October 1.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. DANNEMEYER), to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. JOHNSON, for 60 minutes, on September 17.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LEVINE of California), to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYDEN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHANDLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McMILLAN.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. HENRY.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Ms. SNOWE.

Mr. STANGELAND.

Mr. DORNAN of California in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DE LUCA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TORRICELLI.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

Mr. COELHO in four instances.

Mr. GARCIA in two instances.

Mr. DYSON in two instances.

Mr. ROBINSON.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

Mr. DARDEN.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. EDGAR in three instances.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. MATSUI in three instances.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. ATKINS.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. GAYDOS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 11, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1957. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 99-105); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1958. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on an expenditure in excess of an appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1959. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the proposed sale or transfer of defense articles in excess of \$50,000,000 from inventories of regular components of the Armed Forces to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. 85-49), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1960. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the proposed sale or transfer of defense articles in excess of \$50,000,000 from inventories of regular components of the Armed Forces to the Federal Republic of Germany (Transmittal No. 85-29), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1961. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the proposed sale or transfer of defense articles in excess of \$50,000,000 from inventories of regular components of the Armed Forces to Korea (Transmittal No. 85-52), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1962. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the proposed sale or transfer of defense articles in excess of \$50,000,000 from inventories of regular components of the Armed Forces to Pakistan (Transmittal No. 85-51), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1963. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Pakistan for defense articles (Transmittal No. 85-51), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1964. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to the United Kingdom for defense articles (Transmittal No. 85-49), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1965. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Pakistan for defense articles (Transmittal No. 85-50), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1966. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to Korea for defense articles (Transmittal No. 85-52), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1967. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed letter of offer to the Federal Republic of Germany for defense articles (Transmittal No. 85-29), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1968. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the administration of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, pursuant to Public Law 92-522, sections 103(f) (94 Stat. 224) and 110(a) (95 Stat. 986); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1969. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the status of the State Department Professional Development Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4023(f); jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

1970. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled: "Cost of Care Information to Patients," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ww note (Public Law 98-21, section 603(a)(3)(D)); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1971. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled: "Study of Foot Care Coverage Under Medicare," pursuant to Public Law 96-499, section 958(g) and (h); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 261. Resolution waiving certain points of order against H.R. 3244, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-259). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1246. A bill to establish a federally declared floodway for the Colorado River below Davis Dam; with an amendment (Rept. 99-261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HAMILTON: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. House Resolution 226. Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to furnish certain information to the House of Representatives relating to American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia (Rept. 99-260, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 148. A bill to designate certain public lands in the State of Michigan as wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than September 24, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X (Rept. 99-262, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DARDEN:

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that the number of diplomatic visas issued to aliens who are residents or nationals of the Soviet Union shall not exceed the number of diplomatic visas issued to residents or nationals of the United States by the Soviet Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 3252. A bill to amend the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide that any rescission of budget authority proposed by the President take effect unless specifically disapproved by the adoption of a joint resolution; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish the National Council on Access to Health Care, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore and protect the benefit levels of workers reaching age 65 in or after 1982 (and their widows and widowers) by eliminating the notch between those levels and the corresponding benefit levels of persons who reached age 65 before 1982; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. DAUB):

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow monthly deposits of payroll taxes for employers with monthly payroll tax payments under \$5,000, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan (for himself, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 3256. A bill to increase the number of U.S. Commissioners on the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act finding the domestic uranium industry nonviable and requiring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue import licenses for imported nuclear source material and special nuclear material only after certification by the Department of Commerce that such imports will not further damage the domestic uranium industry; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the treatment of loans with below-market interest rates shall not apply to obligations issued by the Government of Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. CROCKETT):

H.R. 3259. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of the mails to send dangerous martial arts weapons; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 3260. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program of services performed by a physician assistant; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 378. Joint resolution designating July 27, 1986, as "Korean Veterans Commemoration Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution designating September 22, 1986, as "American Business Women's Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in support of the efforts of the organizers of and participants in the Farmaid Concert to be held in Champaign, IL, to bring the current crisis in American agriculture to the attention of the American people; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution expressing solidarity with the Sakharov family; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 650: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 669: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 693: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 983: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1021: Mr. CHAPPIE and Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 1059: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LUKE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.R. 1139: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1272: Mr. MacKAY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1279: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1550: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1615: Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 1659: Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1668: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1704: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois and Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1769: Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 1811: Mr. BROWN of Colorado and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 1815: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1888: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1893: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1969: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1970: Mr. SMITH of Florida and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1973: Mr. GREGG.

H.R. 2189: Mr. WHITTEN, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2205: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 2280: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 2349: Mr. KASICH and Mr. HILLIS.

H.R. 2440: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2452: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2741: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BONKER, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 2805: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LELAND, Mr. HILER, Mrs. COLLINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. REID, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 2840: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 2869: Mr. WHITEHURST and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 2907: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2963: Mr. RODINO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2975: Mr. YATRON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 3006: Ms. MIKULSKI and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 3068: Mr. WEBER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. COELHO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. STUDDS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3100: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 3173: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. COBEY, Mr. STANGELAND, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 175: Mr. LIGHTFOOT and Mr. DAUB.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MAVEROULES, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.J. Res. 352: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H. Res. 212: Mr. KOLTER and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2600: Mr. EDGAR.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2266

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

—Page 2, line 10, strike out "\$616,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$581,400,000".

H.R. 3228

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

—Page 3, strike out lines 1 through 17.
—Page 16, line 4, strike out "Provided further," and all that follows through "Africa:" in line 8.

H.R. 3244

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

—Page 35, after line 25, insert the following new section:

Sec. 304. The Federal Aviation Administration shall develop and publish in the Federal Register guidelines for the selection of locations for Airway Facility Sector

Headquarters Offices to ensure consistent criteria for the selection of locations which require the lowest life-cycle costs consistent with the functions of such Offices.

Redesignate subsequent sections accordingly.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

—On page 15, line 9 strike the "." and insert the following in lieu thereof: "Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be used for the approval of, or to pay the salary of any person who approves, projects to construct a landfill in the Hudson River as part of an Interstate System highway in New York City."

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

—At the end of the bill add the following new section:

Sec. 326. The limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 1986 shall not apply to obligations for the Bypass Highway Demonstration Project and the Los Angeles Freight Transportation Demonstration.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

—Page 24, line 11, strike out "\$616,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$581,400,000".

By Mr. WAXMAN:

Page 41, strike out line 14 and all that follows through page 42, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) None of the funds described in subsection (a) may be made available for any segment of the Downtown Los Angeles to the

San Fernando Valley Metro Rail Project unless—

(1) the Southern California Rapid Transit District establishes an independent committee of experts to conduct detailed studies of the entire Metro Rail Project route and the potential hazards associated with the occurrence of methane gas;

(2) before the expiration of the 9-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the committee established under paragraph (1) submits recommendations to the Southern California Rapid Transit District regarding any adjustments in the Metro Rail Project route that are required to avoid tunneling into or through any area where the occurrence of methane gas presents a potential hazard;

(3) the Southern California Rapid Transit District submits to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration binding plans that—

(A) incorporate the recommendations of the committee submitted under paragraph (2); and

(B) indicate that no part of the Metro Rail Project will tunnel into or through any zone designated as a potential risk zone or high potential risk zone in the report of the City of Los Angeles dated June 10, 1985, and entitled "Task Force Report on the March 24, 1985 Methane Gas Explosion and Fire in the Fairfax Area"; and

(4) the Urban Mass Transportation Administration approves such plans.